<u>REMARKS</u>

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 3 and 5 are cancelled.

New claims 8 and 9 are added. Support for the claims is found, for example, on page 15, line 13 through page 19, line 11, of the application.

In view of the above, claims 1, 2 and 6-9 are currently pending.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3 and 5-7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER GAI ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,167,445) IN VIEW OF PRAGER ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 5,838,918)

Claim 1 is amended herein to incorporate the features of dependent claims 3 and 5. Claim 7 is amended to recite somewhat similar features. Amended claim 1 recites that the management domains communicate via a network, each management domain having at least one communication entity and a communication setting management apparatus. The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art fails to teach the above features.

Gai discusses that "a network administrator first selects an overall traffic template for a given network domain and may assign various applications and/or users to the corresponding traffic type of the template." Column 6, lines 2-6, of Gai. "The network administrator preferably defines a separate Quality of Service (QoS) or network domain for each region and assigns a primary policy server." Column 10, lines 44-47, of Gai. However, Gai does not disclose that each management domain has a *communication setting management apparatus*. Gai simply states that the administrator may select an overall traffic template for a given network domain.

Amended claim 1 further recites that the communication setting management apparatus imparts, on a management domain basis, different communication characteristics settings to respective communications between communication entities belonging to different management domains, each communication characteristics setting being managed on a corresponding management domain basis. Claim 7 recites somewhat similar features. The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art also fails to teach these features.

Gai discusses that a "network administrator preferably identifies various regions of his or her computer network 300 to which he or she wishes to have different, high-level traffic management policies applied." See column 10, lines 38-41, of Gai. "The identification of such regions may depend on any number of factors, such as geographic location, business unit (e.g., engineering, marketing or administrative), anticipated network demands, etc." Column 10, lines

41-44, of Gai. Per the arguments above, Gai fails to disclose a communication setting management apparatus. Further, Gai does not disclose that any such apparatus imparts different communication characteristics settings for communications with other management domains. Gai only discusses that the network administrator identifies various regions in the network that have different management policies. Prager, both individually and in combination with Gai, also fails to teach this feature.

Amended claim 1 further recites a contradiction detection function unit belonging to one of the management domains that mutually interchanges information between communication setting management apparatuses disposed in different management domains and detects a contradiction between the mutually interchanged information and the setting template and the application rule of the domain of the contradiction detection unit. Claim 7 recites somewhat similar features. The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art further fails to teach these features.

Gai discusses that "[t]he policy translator 410 also interfaces with the policy validation tool (PVT) 413 to identify any conflicting policies." See column 17, lines 33-35, of Gai. "For example, two policies may call for different shaping or marking to be applied to the same traffic stream." See column 17, lines 38-40, of Gai. However, Gai is silent as to a contradiction detection function unit that mutually interchanges information between communication setting management apparatuses disposed in different management domains. Again, per the above, Gai does not disclose a communication setting management apparatus for each domain. Further, Gai does not disclose a unit that mutually interchanges information between any such apparatuses disposed in different management domains. As is readily apparent from Fig. 4 of Gai and the associated description thereof, this does not occur. Prager, both individually and in combination with Gai, also fails to teach this feature. Thus, as clarified by the above arguments, the cited art fails to render claim 1 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The above comments are specifically directed to claim 1. However, It is respectfully submitted that the above comments would be helpful in understanding various differences of various other claims over the cited art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III.   NEW CLAIM

New claim 8 is added herein. Claim 8 recites imparting contradicted setting templates to the communication entities, thereby avoiding problems where communication between the entities fails. It is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is also distinguishable over the cited art.

New claim 9 is also added herein. Claim 9 recites a method, comprising:

mutually interchanging information between communication setting management apparatuses disposed in different management domains via a network, each management domain having at least one communication entity and a communication setting management apparatus that imparts, on a management domain basis, different communication characteristics settings to respective communications between communication entities belonging to different management domains, each communication characteristics setting being managed on a corresponding management domain basis; and

detecting a contradiction, via a contradiction detection unit belonging to one of the management domains, between the mutually interchanged information and a setting template and an application rule of the management domain of the contradiction detection unit.

Thus, per the arguments above, claim 9 also distinguishes over the cited art.

IV. CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _8-27-07_ By: _Michael A. Leonard II_

Michael A. Leonard II
Registration No. 60,180

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501